

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SECOND APPELLATE DISTRICT

DIVISION FIVE

In re MICHAEL W., a Person Coming
Under the Juvenile Court Law.

B239839
(Los Angeles County
Super. Ct. No. NJ26175)

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

MICHAEL W.,

Defendant and Appellant.

APPEAL from a judgment of the Superior Court of Los Angeles County. John C. Lawson II, Judge. Affirmed.

Marta I. Stanton, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

On June 3, 2011, a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 was filed, alleging that Michael W. committed one count of vandalism under \$400, in violation of Penal Code section 594, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor, and one count of trespass, in violation of Penal Code section 602, subdivision (m), a misdemeanor. At the adjudication and dispositional hearing on June 22, 2011, appellant admitted the trespass; the juvenile court found the trespass to be true, sustained the petition, and dismissed the vandalism count. The court declared appellant a ward of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, and ordered appellant placed home on probation.

On July 20, 2011, a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 was filed, alleging that appellant committed petty theft in violation of Penal Code section 484, subdivision (a), a misdemeanor. At the adjudication hearing on September 13, 2011, appellant admitted the theft; the juvenile court found the count to be true and sustained the petition. At the dispositional hearing on September 28, 2011, the juvenile court declared appellant a ward of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 and placed him on CDP house arrest for 45 days.

On December 5, 2011, a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 777 was filed, alleging that appellant violated probation. On December 19, 2011, appellant was placed on CDP until February 23, 2012.

On February 14, 2012, a petition pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602 was filed, alleging that appellant had committed the offense of possessing metal knuckles in violation of Penal Code section 21810, a felony. Appellant moved to dismiss pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 701.1 based on insufficiency of the evidence. The juvenile court denied the motion, and denied appellant's Penal Code section 17, subdivision (b) motion to reduce the offense to a misdemeanor.

At the adjudication and dispositional hearing on March 8, 2012, the juvenile court found the count of possession of brass knuckles to be true and sustained the petition. The court declared appellant a ward of the court pursuant to Welfare and Institutions Code section 602, found appellant to be in violation of probation, and ordered him suitably

placed. The court ordered that appellant could not be held in physical confinement for a period to exceed three years, four months.

A timely notice of appeal was filed. We appointed counsel to represent appellant on this appeal. Finding no error, we affirm the judgment.

On February 3, 2012, at approximately 12:30 p.m., Derek Jones was working as an on-campus security officer at Woodrow Wilson High School in Long Beach when he contacted appellant on campus. Jones asked appellant to empty his pockets. Appellant took out most of the items from his pocket, but Jones saw an object drop back into appellant's pocket. Jones asked appellant what else he had in his pocket; appellant pulled out a set of brass knuckles. Appellant explained that the knuckles were actually a belt buckle with a missing pin; he intended to stop by a hardware store on his way home from school to purchase the piece required to fix the belt buckle.

After examination of the record, counsel filed an opening brief which contained an acknowledgment that she had been unable to find any arguable issues. On July 13, 2012, we advised appellant that he had 30 days within which to personally submit any contentions or issues which he wished us to consider. No response has been received to date.

We have examined the entire record and are satisfied that appellant's attorney has fully complied with her responsibilities and that no arguable issues exist. (*People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436, 441.)

DISPOSITION

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN THE OFFICIAL REPORTS

We concur:

ARMSTRONG, Acting P. J.

MOSK, J.

KRIEGLER, J.